

## REMARKS

The drawing objections specified by the Examiner have been corrected in the corrected drawings filed with this amendment. The objections to the specification have been corrected herein.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stein (US 6,175,590 B1) in view of Cheetham et al. (US 4,727,495). Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitations of: determining a plurality of transport format combinations; for each of the plurality of transport format combinations, determining a Cyclic Redundancy Check (CRC) metric for each channel component of the transport format combination, and combining the CRC metric of each channel component to form a transport format combination metric; and determining which one of the plurality of transport combinations was used based on the transport format combination metrics.

Stein does not disclose a method including determining a CRC metric for each channel component of a transport format combination, combining the CRC metric of each channel component to form a transport format combination metric and determining the transport combination utilized based on the transport format combination metrics. Stein does not teach determining a CRC metric for each channel component of a transport format combination because Stein does not teach a plurality of transport channels multiplexed onto a single signal. Stein teaches calculating CRCs for the possible data rates that can be used on a single channel. Further, Stein does not combine the CRC metric of each channel component to form a transport format combination metric because in Stein there is only a single channel component.

It would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cheetham with the teachings of Stein to product Applicants' invention. While, Cheetham teaches a means for multiplexing a plurality of formatted information channels received at line circuits into a single time division multiplexed input data stream, Cheetham does not teach how a combination of channels having a plurality of transport formats may be deformatted. Stein also does not teach deformatting of multiple channels on a single data stream since Stein does not teach use of multiple channels.

Claims 6 and 7 have been cancelled, thus mooted the rejection of these claims. Applicants submit that claim 10 is not made obvious by the teachings of Stein and Cheetham based on the reasoning set forth above.

Claims 3-4, 8-9 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Examiner states that in these claims, “arg max” is not defined in the specification; the value of pi to be used for different conditions in the equation “ $\pi \in \{24, 16, 12, 8, 0\}$ ” which appears in the claims is not defined in the specification. Applicants submit that “arg max” is a term commonly known in the art to mean the argument that maximizes the quantity following the word “max”. For example

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \max \sin(3.14159 * k/2) &= 1, \text{ for } k \text{ element of } \{0, 1, 2, 3\} \text{ because} \\ \sin(3.14159 * 0/2) &= 0 \\ \sin(3.14159 * 1/2) &= 1 \\ \sin(3.14159 * 2/2) &= 0 \\ \sin(3.14159 * 3/2) &= -1. \end{aligned}$$

Applicants submit that “pi” is sufficiently described in the specification on page 7, line 12 as the number of bits in the CRC of the ith transport channel. It is commonly known that the typical number of bits is either 14, 16, 12, 8 or 0.

Claims 3-4, 8-9 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. “K” is a variable equal to the total number of transport combinations which could be used on a channel. “k” is a variable used as an index of the hypothesized format combinations. See page 6, line 22 of the specification where it states  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ .  $\hat{k}$  represents the index of the format combination used (the format combination that the method is trying to determine) as shown in equation (8) on page 7 of the specification. Claims 3-4 and 12-13 have been amended for clarity accordingly.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that independent claims 1 and 10 are in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-5 and 11-13 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 10, respectively. Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the now pending claims.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to  
**50-2117.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Wang, Michael, et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: 

Lalita W. Pace  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 39,427  
Telephone: 847-538-5855  
Fax: 847-576-3750